



KNOWLEGE . . . LIBERTY . . . UTILITY . . . REPRESENTATION . . . RESPONSIBILITY.

VOL. I.

PHILADELPHIA, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1834.

NO. 33.

DEMOCRATIC UNION FESTIVAL.
TRIUMPH OF PRINCIPLE!!!

At an adjourned meeting of the several Committees of Correspondence of the First, Second and Third Districts, for making arrangements to celebrate the late GLORIOUS TRIUMPHS of DEMOCRACY in the three great Democratic States of

NEW YORK,
NEW JERSEY, and
PENNSYLVANIA,

COL. JOHN THOMPSON was called the Chair, and HENRY SIMPSON, appointed Secretary.

The Committees from the Three Districts adopted the following Regulations for the convenience of our fellow citizens:

DINNER, SUPPER and LODGING to be provided for each individual, for TWO DOLLARS, being the price of a Ticket.

The Trenton Rail Road Company to convey passengers to and from Trenton for ONE Dollar—or FIFTY Cents each way.

The Cars with the Locomotive will leave Philadelphia at the hours of SIX and TEN, A.M. on the day of the FESTIVAL—exclusively for the use of the company intending to join in the Celebration—A Band of Music will accompany the Delegation from Pennsylvania.

Tickets to be had at the house of Mrs. MOOSE or the Treasurer, Mr. Krider, for 1st District—AMOS HOLLAHAN, or the Treasurer, Wm. Stephens, for 2d District—Franklin House, or the Treasurer, Benjamin E. Carpenter, for 3d District.

From the Lafayette (Ia.) Mercury.

Notwithstanding the union and co-operation of the late National Republican and Nullification parties (but now Swigs, although their principles are as opposite as the cardinals of north and south) in opposing the measures of the administration, and abusing the President, as time rolls on, and the Presidential question becomes more and more agitated, the seed of discord is seen sprouting, and each faction is veering off, and organizing to bring their respective candidates into the field. Judging from the tone of the organs of two factions, we can but conclude that the fatal spark has fallen into the magazine. Gen. D. Green, the nullification Swig organ, declares that the nullification swigs must, and shall have a candidate, and that they will not go for a national republican swig, be he Mr. Clay or any other person; that sooner than go for Mr. Clay, the nullifying swigs would go for Mr. Van Buren, as the democratic principles of Mr. Van Buren are preferable to the federal principles of Mr. Clay and the National Republican Swig party.

Gen. Green's object is to get Mr. Calhoun or some other nullifying swig out with Mr. Clay and Mr. Van Buren, so as to carry the election into the House of Representatives—where he says the nullifying swigs will hold the balance of power, and, like Mr. Clay in 1824, we suppose they would make the best bargain they could for themselves, although he declares that Mr. Van Buren's democratic principles are much preferable to Mr. Clay's federal swig principles.

The Federal Swig organs, of course, have been coaxing Gen. Green to desist, and unite on Mr. Clay, or their candidate, whatever it may be, but to no avail. He is determined to hold the balance of power, if the union of the nullifying swigs will do it. Like the march of intellect, Gen. Green thinks must be the progress of Nullification; and to promote which, having failed to do it by storm and bombast, they must take part with the Democratic party; that occupying the middle ground between Consolidation and Nullification.

The opposition papers in the West, although they are fully aware of dissensions in the south and east, are silent on the subject; and holding up Mr. McLean as the candidate on whom the whole opposition will unite. We are satisfied that Mr. Clay will never suffer Mr. McLean to be put into nomination before himself. Mr. Clay has determined that if any Western man is to be the President of the United States in his day, that he himself is the man. Many of his leading journals, as well as himself, speak in the most contemptible manner of Judge McLean. Mr. Clay has said that 'he carried water on both shoulders; had the confidence of neither party, and was unworthy the confidence of the American people.'

Time is the crucible that refines and separates the elements of the opposition, which only need be separated to be dissipated.

MR. VAN BUREN IN HIS NATIVE COUNTY.

There is nothing in the recent contest more gratifying than the result in the native county of Mr. Van Buren. A more desperate struggle has never been witnessed at our polls. The anxiety to mark Mr. Van Buren with vote of condemnation in the county of his nativity, was manifested strongly here, but more strongly in other parts of the State, insomuch that aid from abroad, of a peculiar character, was sent to the opposition here, and the most active efforts used to wrest this county from us. But all in vain. Mr. Van Buren's native town, Kinderhook, has given more than 150 majority for our ticket, and this county—the scene of his early struggles, where he was best known, and where for years, he contended manfully, against the powerful manor influence of the Van Rensselaer and Livingston families, sustained, as it ever was, by the aid of great talents and a concentrated monied power, and where for more than thirty years the Democratic cause never triumphed, has given for our ticket, a majority larger than has been witnessed at any strongly contested election for nearly forty years! We repeat that we have never known such an effort to carry this county against the Democracy as has been made this year, both in and out of the country. The opposition counted largely upon the moral effect of their success in Columbia, and confidently expected a favorable result. They have been woefully disappointed. And if the judgment of the honest and incorruptible yeomanry of our country—if the unbiased decision of those who have known him longest and best, is of any value to Mr. Van Buren, he has those benefits in this, the county of his birth.—*Hudson N. Y. Gazette.*

MR. WEBSTER.

The Federal swigs of New York were so sure of carrying the city, that Mr. Webster came all the way from Boston to grace the anticipated triumph. He took lodgings near to the Federal head quarters, which were held at Masonic Hall, and was to have been proclaimed swig candidate for President, with all the pageantry of crowning a king, on the evening of the third day, if they had succeeded. And then bonfires were to have blazed—bells to have rung—cannon roared—and the black cockade would have been mounted on every swig hat the next morning, as the signal of return to the reign of terror. The friends of legitimacy in France had not more joy in store, when they were looking forward to the restoration of the Bourbons, than had the Federal swigs in anticipation of their glorious victory!! But thanks to the free spirit of a free people—their visions are scattered into thin air. Mr. Webster must go home again, and leave his nomination speech undelivered.

It is astonishing that a man of his sense and experience should not have known better, than to be thus humbugged and fooled by such men as Webb, Stone, Dwight, and Charles King—men whom he ought to have known are never right, except by mistake, and who seek the wrong side by instinct. But, as Bonaparte once said, "these Bourbons learn nothing by experience,"—and it is pretty much so with our Federal Bourbons—they will be wrong, maugre all their wisdom. How must Calhoun chuckle to see his great rival in the swig ranks thus balked and check-mated in his first grand move towards stealing a march of his fellow swig candidates!—*New Haven Register.*

From the Albany Argus.

MR. WRIGHT AND THE DEMOCRACY OF NEW YORK.

Never have the pledges of a representative been more signalized or honorably redeemed by his constituents, than have been those of Mr. Wright, by the Democracy of New York. All will remember the circumstances under which the opening speech of Mr. Wright, on the Bank question was made—the thrilling interest which it excited, as well in Congress as throughout the country.

It was at the very darkest hour—when the criminal efforts of ambition and cupidity were, to all appearances, upon the point of succeeding—when the timid, the selfish and the time-serving, were seeking shelter under the various modifications of the main

question, and when most of those who were firm and sincere, were alarmed by the diversities of opinion that were prevalent among the friends of the administration. It was under circumstances like these when common minds faltered—when the Bank was lording it over the country—when its minions became insolent and its feed advocates arrogant and overbearing, that New York's honored representative stepped forward, and speaking in the name of its democracy, advanced with that modesty which never deserts him, but with all that intrepidity and firmness which belongs to his nature, the sentiments which we once more lay before our readers.

They are sentiments which would have done honor to our national councils in the proudest days of the republic—sentiments which will forever do honor to him who uttered them, and the confirmation of which, by the people of this State, must forever seal the lips of those who could insinuate that the Democratic party, in the mighty conflicts it has maintained for the preservation of equal rights and constitutional liberty, was moved by no higher consideration than a selfish desire to change the location of a monied corporation from Philadelphia to New York.

The Democratic party of this State, as a body, go against the Bank, not only as an engine dangerous to the liberties and equal rights of the people, but in the strong and emphatic language of Mr. Wright, they "go against this Bank, and against any and every Bank to be incorporated by Congress, whether to be located at Philadelphia or New York, or any where else within the twenty-four independent States, which compose this confederacy, upon the broad ground, WHICH ADMITS NOT OF COMPROMISE, THAT CONGRESS HAS NOT THE POWER, BY THE CONSTITUTION, TO INCORPORATE SUCH A BANK."

How nobly the electors of New York have borne out Mr. Wright in the "confident expression of an opinion that the State would sustain the Executive to the utmost in this controversy," may be gathered from the facts that Gov. Marcy is re-elected by a majority of between thirteen and fourteen thousand, being an increase from 1832, of about 4000 in his majority; and thirty-one anti-Bank members have been returned to the 24th Congress; that anti-Bank Senators have been chosen in seven of the eight Senate districts; and that at least 95 out of 128 members of Assembly have been elected who are friendly to the administration and opposed to the Bank.

We like the manner in which the Editor of the Nashville Banner supports General Jackson. After premising that the honesty of the old hero was now almost universally admitted, and that he might have reposed on a bed of down if he had rechartered the Bank, the editor closes his remarks with the observation that he has "more confidence in the honesty and patriotism of the President than in that of all the other public men in the United States put together." This seems sufficiently extravagant, and yet, Gen. Jackson, occupying the first station in the country, has shrunk from no responsibility thrown upon him. All the influences and motives that could be brought to bear upon him, could not deter him from vetoing the Maysville Road Bill. A power still more tremendous was exercised to induce him to sign the bill to re-charter the Bank, and because he refused, it has been employed to vilify and degrade and sink him in public estimation. He has, on these occasions, done what was right, believing, that time would redeem his character from the momentary obloquy of short-sighted and partisan politicians; and he has not been mistaken. He has given conspicuity to his honesty because of the pre-eminence of his station; and the Banner may, from intimate acquaintance, as well as his public acts, be well justified in this declaration. Now these are qualities which we particularly admire, and as we wish to see them shine as brilliantly in his successor, it is on this account we have been in favor of Hugh L. White, as the Chief Magistrate; a man whose integrity and talents are universally admitted wherever he is known.—*Knoxville (Tenn.) Register.*



PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM DUANE

PHILADELPHIA, NOV. 26, 1834.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In conformity with the terms of subscription to this paper, it is requested that those who have, through any cause, omitted to pay the advance of 5 dollars, will be pleased to do so without delay, in order that preparation for a daily publication may be made before the meeting of Congress.

The Editor employs no collector, because the fair wages of such a person would be a reduction of so much of the subscription.—Payment will be received every week day, before ten o'clock or between one and three o'clock, at the office, Elizabeth St. or from ten to one, and three to five, at No. 7, State House Buildings.

THE AMERICAN ALMANAC,

AND REPOSITORY OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.

Under this title there has been published a handsome annual volume, of about 340 pages, of excellent materials, and printed with most creditable accuracy and care.—Besides the actual Almanac, or register of months and days, in the usual style of such periodicals, this work embraces a great variety of useful information—astronomical, historical, statistical, and indeed every description of information which ingenious industry can select for the purposes of reference, and marking the progress of useful social intelligence. The celestial phenomena, festivals, the Hebrew and Mohamedan calendars, eclipses, comets, aspects of the planets, the tides, ephemeris of the sun, meteorology and meteors; annuity tables; ratio of mortality among nations; banks, general and particular; steam-boats, &c. The Executive and Congress of the United States, the Judiciary, Foreign intercourse, Navy, Public Debt, Finance, Commerce, Mint, Laws and Tables of the Coinage, and Statistical Tables of each of the twenty-four States and the four Territories. Tables of times of Elections; Governors, their terms and salaries; Theological Seminaries; Medical and Law Schools; Colleges of the United States; Ecclesiastical details; the periodical press; reviews and magazines, and their chronologies. The foreign colonies in America; reigning Monarchs of Europe; the deaths of distinguished Foreigners, and of distinguished Americans, and a chronicle of interesting events.

This is a general abstract of the contents of the volume for 1835. We have seen only four of the preceding years, though we apprehend there were five, but each varies, in some measure, from the other, and affords a very well conceived, and as well executed, a medium, by which the events and relations of the civilized world are exhibited and commemorated.

The philosophical astronomy of this book is reputable to the United States, as well for its extent and excellence, as the manner of its development; and it has not spared the use of the graver to furnish very handsome maps, in miniature, of the paths of comets, and the observation of eclipses. In the present volume, there is an ingenious table of the path of the Comet of Halley, which appears, according to the received system, in the ensuing year, as calculated by three European astronomers, M. Ponticoulant and M. Demoisan, of France, and Mr. Lubbock, of England. The upper and lower horizontal margin is marked by the hour of ascension in Roman numerals; the sides designatory of north and south declination, in arithmetical figures. The track is marked by its progress through the constellations, and the names of stars of five magnitudes.

We do not hesitate to say that this annual is universal to the country; and such as no gentle man, whose leisure employments, or studies, are connected with exact knowledge, should be without.

The Statistics are highly useful, not merely as matters of fact, but matter for reasoning upon, and as a collection

of facts in our periodical literature, are very interesting and amusing.

In this PAPER AGE, when Banking has usurped so much, it is not surprising to find this annual amply stored with its relations; and it appears to furnish the latest and most accurate information on this diffusive disease.

Though the publication is no otherwise political than it is statistical and financial, it lets out, now and then, a little of the modern Evangelical, as well as the common law notions of a nose of wax Constitution. Not from itself, but in the citation of an authority, which in New England, where the geese are all swans, is very high. We mean an extract from Judge Story's Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States. We had heard of those Commentaries before, but as they do not lie "in the course of our reading," we had concluded that, like all the disciples of Blackstone, the Judge would coincide in construing the Constitution upon precedent or the dicta of the brotherhood; and it appears we were not mistaken, so we shall give the extract, just as we find it, in page 295, of the Almanac, only adding a few remarks:

Constitutionality of a United States or National Bank.

The following extract from Mr. Justice Story's "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," gives a brief summary of the principal arguments for and against the constitutionality of a United States or National Bank.

"One of the earliest and most important measures, which gave rise to a question of constitutional power, was the act chartering the Bank of the United States in 1791. The question has often since been discussed; and though the measure has been repeatedly sanctioned by Congress, by the executive, and by the judiciary, and has obtained the like favor in the great majority of the states, yet it is, up to this very hour, still debated upon constitutional grounds, as if it still were new and untried. It is impossible, at this time, to treat it as an open question, unless the constitution is for ever an unsettled text, possessing no permanent attributes, and incapable of having any ascertained sense; varying with every change of doctrine, and of party; and delivered over to interminable doubts.

The reasoning, upon which the constitutionality of a national bank is denied, turns upon the strict interpretation of the clause, giving auxiliary powers, necessary and proper to execute the other enumerated powers. It is to the following effect. The power to incorporate a bank is not among those enumerated in the constitution. In the next place all the enumerated powers can be carried into execution without a bank. A bank therefore is not necessary, and consequently not authorized by this clause of the constitution. It is urged that a bank will give great facility, or convenience to the collection of taxes. If this were true, yet the constitution allows only the means which are necessary, and not merely which are convenient for effecting the enumerated powers. If such a latitude of construction were allowed, as to consider convenience as justifying the use of such means, it would follow up all the enumerated powers. Therefore, the constitution restrains Congress to those means, without which the power would be nugatory.

"The reasoning by which the constitutionality of the national bank is sustained is [in part] contained in the following summary. The powers confined to the national government are unquestionably, so far as they exist, sovereign and supreme. It is not, and cannot be disputed, that the power of creating a corporation is one belonging to sovereignty. But so are all other legislative powers; for the original power of giving the law on any subject whatever is a sovereign power. If the erecting of a corporation be an incident to sovereignty, and it is not prohibited, it must belong to the national government in relation to the objects entrusted to it. The true difference is this; where the authority of a government is general, it can create corporations in all cases; when it is confined to certain branches of legislation, it can create corporations only as to those cases. It cannot be denied, that implied powers may be delegated as well as express. It follows that a power to erect corporations may as well be implied, as any other thing, if it be an instrument, or means of carrying into execution any specified power.

"It is true, that among the enumerated powers, we do not find that of establishing a bank or creating a corporation. But we do find there the great powers to lay and collect taxes; to borrow money; to regulate commerce; to declare and conduct war; and to raise and support armies. Now if a bank be a fit means to execute any or all of these powers, it is just as much implied as any other means. If it be 'necessary and proper' for any of the n^o, how is it possible to deny the authority to create it for such purposes? There is no more propriety in giving this power in express terms, than in giving any other incidental power or means in express terms.

"That a national bank is an appropriate means to carry into effect some of the enumerated powers of the government, and that this can be best done by erecting it into a corporation, may be established by the most satisfactory reasoning. It has a relation, more or less direct, to the power of collecting taxes, to that of borrowing money, to that of regulating trade between states, and to those of raising and maintaining fleets and armies. And it may be added that it has a most important bearing upon the regulation of currency between the states. It is an instrument,

which has been applied by governments, in the administration of their fiscal and financial operations; and in the present times it can hardly require argument to prove, that it is a convenient, a useful, and an essential instrument in the fiscal operations of the United States."

Judge Story, like all lawyers, cannot travel out of the trammels of the Common Law of England, which never was adopted in any form which could conflict with our written Constitutions; to the United States' Courts it is absolutely denied; and yet here is a Judge, who has no Common Law authority, undertakes to construe the Constitution from which he derives his functions, by Common Law principles!

It will be perceived that the title of this article pre-determines the argument, by an affirmative allegation, but that the three first lines of the Judge's words, go to an impotent conclusion, since it says no more than that an act was passed chartering a Bank, but offers no opinion on its constitutionality; still a fact merely inferential or contingent like the opinions of judges in the courts of law, the uncertainty of whose opinions and constructions of law are such as to require courts of a higher grade, to reconsider the opinions and judgments of those below them.

Lawyers imagine that legal usages comprehend and govern every science; that nothing can be done but by legal artifice; that there is no truth but in Common Law rules; and that instead of being a mere emanation of legislation, the machinery of the pragmatic and capricious notions of men who are constantly in contradiction of each other and of common sense, must be preferred to a deliberately digested code of constitutional principles.

This summary is another and a serious evidence of the necessity of rendering the tenure of the Judiciary periodical and responsible. In the present situation of the Judiciary, the Judges go with the Aristocracy of Paper. The argument in common use by the cunning or the duped, is, that the Judiciary should be independent,—imagining that the word independence here means the same as in England. There the independence of the Judiciary was meant independence of the king, who could remove a Judge, as many were removed and imprisoned for disobedience to the crown; when the Judges were made to hold office during good behavior, it was to keep them free from the overbearing power of the crown. Such a case does not exist here; the founders of the Constitution were, too many of them, lawyers; and some of them not very well disposed to responsible institutions; but it was under this misapprehension of independence that the Judges were made wholly irresponsible, and we are not surprised that, like all other men above accountability, they sin with impunity.

As lawyers too generally bestow little attention and less regard on other branches of knowledge, they can never go out of the record to seek for the foundation of constitutional principles. Thus Judge Story says the question of a Bank has been "repeatedly discussed and sanctioned by Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary, yet it continues to be debated on constitutional grounds."

This is the quintessence of lawyerography; and he finishes his notion in a corresponding strain: "It is impossible to treat it as an open question, unless the Constitution is for ever an unsettled text."

And so he goes on in Common Law fashion,—never once taking into view that a Legislature may do wrong, as well as an Executive, or a Judiciary, of which our history affords already too many examples. The Judge makes no account of the powers by the Convention; and he does not perceive that questions of expediency are always equivocal, disputable, and too often fatal.

We refer to Mr. Madison's Speech, in this day's Aurora, for further refutation.

The Judge never dreams of the Constitution being wholly dependant on another constitutional principle of absolute obligation and guarantee to the people—with which neither necessity nor convenience can interfere—or

that the Constitution had already exercised its *sovereign power* in such a manner as to leave no room for such an institution,—even if it had no objectionable properties as a deception, an imposition, and a tax.

Though the Judge affects to give the *pro* and the *con*, in a hypothetical way, as the sentiments of others, it is done like a lawyer, who shuts his eyes against any evidence which stands in the way of his case in his *brief*. It may, therefore, be useful to take the thread of his hypothesis, and see what it is worth.

1. His first affirmative proposition is, that the powers vested in the National Government are, *so far as they exist*, sovereign and supreme.

2. This must be admitted—so far as they exist. It need not be disputed that the sovereign has the power to create a Corporation.

But this is an imperfect definition. Without arguing the power, which is not necessary, there are other considerations: for example, the ends, or objects, or bearings, of a Corporation; for the power, as here expressed, is an unqualified power. The Government, then, has not that power, for if it had, it could transfer National Legislation to a Corporation. It could not vest a Corporation with exclusive powers to fish on the coast; or to plant Indian corn; or to build ships; or to do any acts which would countervene constitutional powers already created. It could not authorize a Corporation to levy *ten per cent.* on all the productions of industry; or to monopolize the sale of flour; or the cultivation of wheat;—and yet, under the Judge's expression of creating a Corporation, being a sovereign power, it could impliedly do all this.

3. Therefore if a Corporation be incident to sovereignty, it must belong to the Government in *relation to the interests intrusted* to it.

Here also we might say granted—when the *relation to the interests intrusted* to it are shown—and shown not to be unconstitutional; for if the sovereignty has been exercised to the full extent of the interests entrusted to it in relation to money, there is no room for a new exercise of what is already complete; much more can the power be exercised when it is an open violation of the already established Constitution, solemnly pledged and guaranteed.

4. Where the authority of the Government is general, it can create Corporations in all cases.

But this is not true in matter or form. The authority is not general, but in this case is opposed by a special and insuperable difficulty; and we have seen above, that even if it was general, there are things which it could not constitutionally or lawfully do. As in our remarks on the second proposition, Congress has no power to authorize a confiscation of 10 per cent. or any other sum, from the pockets of the people, much less to grant powers so to do in open violation of the Constitution, it is not necessary to argue about partial cases.

5. It cannot be denied that implied powers may be delegated as well as express.

It would not be requisite to examine this proposition, because it covers a sophism; but it is met by an absolute fact. Implied powers cannot be granted, in violation of express powers, which is the fact in the case assumed,

Now to all this sophistry, the answer is simple and unequivocal. Congress exercising the sovereign authority of the coinage, has guaranteed money of gold and silver. A charter to issue paper is a breach of that part of the Constitution and of the Law; an absolute breach of public faith. The Law makes it felony to debase the coin; but the law which authorizes a corporation to issue paper violates the Constitution and the Law.

So through all this sophistication, the Judge looks only to the *Bank brief*, and pays no regard to that which he is sworn to maintain, the Constitution and Laws.

The power to lay and collect taxes, is a sovereign power; but it is a violation of the sovereign power to invest a corporation with authority to lay and levy taxes on the people, which the Bank does to an annual amount greater than double the revenue. To borrow money is also a legal power; but paper is not money—but a fraud. So of the rest of this nonsense.

He says now, if a Bank be a *fit* means to execute the powers, it is as much implied as any other. But your *if* is a great conjurer, and might be shortly answered by an *if not*,—and the one argument would be as good as the other, until the *fitness* be first shown.

Then he says, it is an appropriate means; but he does not condescend to show either fitness or appropriateness, and it is thus that the people of this nation are baffled and abused by men who are entrusted with the administration of the laws.

Truly it is time the Judiciary tenure were reduced to some term that would put an end to those fictions and sophistications which the *lawyer corps* so uniformly deal in.

MYTHOLOGY.

A few years since a whimsical French writer undertook to prove the universal *cowardice* of mankind, by showing that *Fear* produces more consequences than any other impulse, and that especially the French Revolution was wholly ascribable to it. The essay formed a small book; but he has not taken the trouble to define his idea of Fear, so that he sometimes confounds cause and effect.

Petronius has asserted that fear was the origin of religion, and that it was the first creator of the gods; but he appears not to have known, that the gods of beneficence, of wonder, benevolence, and gratitude, preceded those that were of the family of malevolence, disease, and fear.

The earliest of all the Gods of the Heathens were the creative, the benign, the generative, the conservative, and the grateful.

Thus the *sun* appears to have had the first of all worship,—which arose out of the experience of its influence on vegetation, its genial warmth, and its splendor.

The worship in which the *egg* was an emblem, arose out of the want of connexion with the great orb of day; Pomponius Mela gives some learning on the *egg*.

It was followed by another worship, that of *Boodh*, of which the reliques are to be found at this day, in a zone of not less than 40 degrees broad, or 2000 miles, the base of which may be taken at Malacca, and its N. W. extremity in Ireland, where the emblematic remains of the worship are to be found at this day, and the very name signifies the thing worshipped.

This worship of the *egg* was one of three branches of the admiration of cause and effect—cause seen, effect seen—the how and why, in short generation, incomprehensible, which inevitably led to a *prior cause*—the greatest of all mysteries; and of which the *Orb* in Pagan rites, and that which is usually considered the *cap of liberty*, but which really is *Boodh*, are emblems of commemoration, as means, not ends, much less cause.

With these were blended the female emblem; and the three formed the *trini'y* personified in *Brahm*; by the addition of an attribute arising out of the experience of death, disease, and the casual evils of supernatural phenomena.

The Brahmins named evil *Sheitan*—no doubt the Satan of Job. The union of this emblem was deemed incompatible with the beneficence which was creative, and the conservative was made a distinct attribute, as well as the destructive; and thus there were three powers.

This mythology is found in Egypt and Persia, as well as India; only in Persia the creative is passive, while the conservative and destructive are at eternal war. Mere allegories founded on the experience of mankind in both living and death. The multiplication of emblematic wor-

ship grew out of the utter impossibility of demonstrating to the senses the objects of benevolent or unseen worship, that is of the operations of nature; and so there had been Gods invented to represent the indescribable, as well as sensual; the evil as well as the good; objects of partial good, or partial evil, were made identical by emblems.

The schismatic Hindus gave their Gods arms or heads, significant of some attribute. The Egyptians found, in certain animals, characteristics suited to express their ideas—the dog, the ibis, the beetle; and the *onion* was worshipped in India and Egypt, because it was considered as an emblem of the globe, composed of layers and circular coats.

And the mythology of Greece and Rome were only particular adaptations of the same ideas, only under different modifications.

Literature requires a *Hindu Pantheon* to correspond with that of *Greece* and *Rome* by Lempriere. Capt. Moore of the Indian army has composed a work of the name, which contains a great body of excellent matter rudely and immethodically arranged. A writer not so well informed, *Charles Coleman*, has made an attempt to improve on Moore, but failed; but as a good work was wanted, that which is imperfect has nevertheless sold profitably, as Moore's book is out of print.

The philosophers among the Brahmins—and there are not less than nine different schools, similar to those of Greece; some of these, like Cicero, consider religion as adapted to rule the vulgar only; and describe their recondite trinity as no more than matter as *Brahm*,—spirit as *Vishna*,—and *Siva*, time.

It would seem that the short commandment in *Exodus*, chap. xx. ver. 7, was derived from the Hindus, as a great portion of their customs, and ceremonies, and Scriptures, are remarkably the same. The Hindu is enjoined not to pronounce the mystic word *O'm*, so that it could be heard by any second person; and when they make an invocation aloud, they address *Ganessa*, an attribute exactly like the Roman *Minerva*, also the deified personification of Wisdom.

The effigies which represent the attributes of *Brahm* are various; on some gold coins are found the human figure, with four faces, interpreted to signify the four gradations, of priests, soldiers, merchants, and laborers. Others are found with five faces, said to be indicative of the senses.

The *Véda*s, or Sacred Books, are four, and teach universal being. It is remarkable that they do not contain a single sentence in relation to symbols, or images, but expressly treat of the Divine unity.

The Hindus say that the conservative power, or *Vichenu*, visited the earth *nine* several times—and that there is to be a *tenth*. The first *avater* was a descent in the form of a fish, *Matysa*. 2. *Kurnia*, or that of a tortoise.—3. *Varaha*, or that of a boar. 4. That of a monster, half man, half lion, or *Narasingha*. 5. *Vamana*, a dwarf.—6. As a man, *Parasa Rama*;—all which occurred in their *satya yoga*, or golden age. 7. In later times, *Ramachandra*, or the descent to destroy a giant; which appears to have some relation to the moon, which, in Sanscrit, is *Chandra*. A celebrated epic, the *Ramayana*, is founded on this *avater*. 8. *Bata Rama*, was also to chastise the race of giants. 9. Was *Bhudda*, a great reformer. The 10th, or *Kalki*, is to come at some future millennium.

Sir William Jones, Mrs. Graham, and the Brahmins themselves, relate that *Chrishna*, which is the name of the conserving power, lived about 900 years before our era; that he was incarnate; that his mother was a virgin; and that in his infancy he was sought to be destroyed; that he passed his life in working miracles, and washed the feet of his followers; that dying, he ascended to heaven in sight of an immense multitude. The names of his mortal parents, were *Vasadeva* and *Devaky*. In Moore's *Pantheon* there is a picture of *Devaky*, and her infant *Chrishna*,

said to be an exact counterpart of Raphael's Madona and child, with glories about their heads, as in some modern pictures.

The English orientalists very generally agree, that the Gods of Egypt and Greece were of Indian origin. The famous mysteries of Elysis were always closed with the words, *conx, om, pax;* the Brahmins at this day close their ceremonies with *cansha, om, paxscha.*

The Hindu books refer their origin to the *White Islands* in the west, and many ingenious dissertations give it plausibility. It is very certain that the religion of Bhuddah prevailed in Ireland, as existing monuments prove.

The nine schools of philosophy which prevail in India, embrace all the topics and speculations to be found in the Greek schools, and the moderns of Europe. Three of them are described by their adversaries as atheists; who, in turn, call their rivals materialists.

The Vedabs are of unusual antiquity, as is visible in their style, and appear to be the foundation of the Hebrew Books, as the cosmogony of Moses, and the principal part of Leviticus, is found in them almost verbatim, and the entire passage about the *Word.*

The Missionaries of different nations have contributed much to the general knowledge of Asia; the French have been the most successful and useful, generally devoting their pursuits to science, as well as morals. The missionaries of the reformed churches are unreservedly hostile to researches into the recondite knowledge of Asia; the ground of exception is by no means reputable to their sagacity or their prudence; the English orientalists are unquestionably the ablest as to critical acquaintance with the languages and learning of the Asiatic nations. Some of those zealots who characterize themselves as *Evangelicals* have produced the breaking up of the Asiatic Society founded by Sir Wm. Jones. It has obtained a sort of revival, but the *Evangelicals* contrive to *post* some two or three zealots, who manage to strangle any thing which they deem disagreeing with the Mosaic cosmogony, and the Noatic flood.

An Asiatic Society was founded in London, five or six years ago, and on it was engrafted another for translating and publishing Oriental Books. This was no sooner formed, than some Church dignitaries were thrust into it, and instead of the science and knowledge of the Brahmins, the works preferred for publication were Arabic, Persian, or some of the numerous dialects, which even to persons conversant with Asiatic manners and languages, are any thing but interesting. A *by-law* of this publishing society says no book shall be published to which any of the committee except, and they always contrive to have a fanatic on the committee—so that these Associations are likely to undergo no *pious innovation* on the *Noatic theorists!*—while the Germans and French with less opportunities are surpassing the English in the number, excellence, and character, of their Oriental translations.

The distribution and proportion of the predominant religious opinions, throughout the known world, is very remarkable.

The greatest estimate made of Christians, which comprehends even all those who deny each other to be Christians, is also curious. We place the religions in the order of numbers:

Buddists	- - - - -	272,000,000
Christians	- - - - -	250,000,000
Brahminists	{ Vichenu Chiven	120,000,000 20,000,000
Moslems	{ Soomies Sheas	40,000,000 20,000,000
Disciples of the Lama	- - - - -	23,000,000
Seiks	- - - - -	8,500,000
Hebrews	- - - - -	6,000,000
Jains	- - - - -	4,100,000
Sufis	- - - - -	3,500,000
Parsis	- - - - -	2,600,000
Wahabees	- - - - -	2,000,000
Worship undefined in Tartary	- - - - -	4,000,000
		785,000,000

From the Richmond Enquirer.
BANK OR NO BANK?

We now lay before our readers the celebrated speech of Mr. Madison, on the first Bank of the United States. Well has it been observed, that it would require more than the talents of Mr. Madison or any other man, to answer it. It is very true, that, at a subsequent period, this distinguished man did sign the present Bank bill—and that he waived his constitutional objections, upon the ground, that all the departments of the government had recognised the constitutionality of a Bank, and that it was necessary to settle the interpretation of the Constitution. But well has it been answered, that according to this doctrine, all that was necessary to justify usurpation, was to make it according to certain forms; and that, upon the same principle, the sedition law itself might be considered constitutional, inasmuch as all the departments of the government had at one time sanctioned it—that Congress had passed it, the President signed it, and the Judiciary had carried it into execution.

But this speech of Mr. Madison cannot be shaken by argument or precedent. It is one of the tersest in its style, and yet the most comprehensive in its views, that ever emanated from the mind of its author. The only fact which it omits in the discussion, is the circumstance, that a proposition was made in the Federal Convention to give the power to grant charters of incorporation, and it was refused.

House of Representatives of the United States, Wednesday, February 2, 1791.

THE BANK BILL UNDER CONSIDERATION.

Mr. MADISON began with a general view of the advantages and disadvantages of banks. The former he stated to consist in, first, the aids they afford to merchants; who can thereby push their mercantile operations farther, with the same capital. 2d. The aids to merchants in paying punctually the customs. 3d. Aids to the government in complying punctually with its engagements, when deficiencies or delays happen in the revenue. 4th. In diminishing usury. 5th. It saving the wear of the gold and silver kept in the vaults, and represented by note. 6th. In facilitating occasional remittances from different places where notes happen to circulate. The effect of the proposed bank, in raising the value of stock, he thought, had been greatly overrated. It would no doubt raise that of the stock subscribed into the bank, but could have little effect on stock in general, as the interest on it would remain the same, and the quantity taken out of market would be replaced by bank stock.

The principal disadvantages consisted in, 1st. Banishing the precious metals, by substituting another medium to perform their office. This effect was inevitable; it was admitted by the most enlightened patrons of banks, particularly by Smith, on the wealth of nations. The common answer to the objection was, that the money banished was only an exchange for something equally valuable that would be imported in return. He admitted the weight of this observation in general, but doubted whether, in the present habits of this country, the return would not be in articles of no permanent use to it. 2d. Exposing the public and individuals to all the evils of a run on the bank, which would be particularly calamitous in so great a country as this, and might happen from various causes, as false rumors, bad management of the institution, and unavoidable balance of trade from short crops, &c.

It was proper to be considered also, that the most important of the advantages would be better obtained by several banks properly distributed, than by a single one. The aids to commerce could only be afforded at or very near the seat of the bank. The same was true of aids to merchants in the payment of customs. Anticipations of the government would also be convenient at the different places where the interest of the debt was to be paid. The case in America was different from that in England; the interest there was all due at one place, and the genius of the monarchy favored the concentration of wealth and influence at the metropolis.

He thought the plan liable to other objections: It did not make so good a bargain for the public as was due to its interests. The charter of the Bank of England had been granted for 11 years only, and was paid for by a loan to the government on terms better than could be elsewhere got. Every renewal of the charter had, in like manner, been purchased; in some instances at a very high price. The same had been done by the banks of Genoa, Naples, and other like banks of circulation. The plan was unequal to the public creditors—it gave an undue preference to the holders of a particular denomination of the public debt, and to those at and within reach of the seat of government. If the subscriptions should be rapid, the distant holders of paper would be excluded altogether.

In making these remarks on the merits of the bill, he had reserved to himself, he said, the right to deny the authority of Congress to pass it. He had entertained this opinion from the date of the Constitution. His impression might perhaps be the

stronger, because he well recollects, that a power to grant charters of incorporation had been proposed in the general convention, and rejected.

Is the power of establishing an *incorporated bank* among the powers vested by the Constitution in the Legislature of the United States? This is the question to be examined.

After some general remarks on the limitations of all political power, he took notice of the peculiar manner in which the Federal Government is limited. It is not a general grant, out of which particular powers are excepted. It is a grant, of particular powers only, leaving the general mass in other hands. So it had been understood by its friends and its foes, and so it was to be interpreted.

As preliminaries to a right interpretation, he laid down the following rules.

An interpretation that destroys the very characteristic of the Government cannot be just.

Where a meaning is clear, the consequences, whatever they may be, are to be admitted—where doubtful, it is fairly triable by its consequences.

In controverted cases, the meaning of the parties to the instrument, if it be recollected by reasonable evidence, is a proper guide.

Contemporary and concurrent expositions are a reasonable evidence of the meaning of the parties.

In admitting or rejecting a constructive authority, not only the degree of its incidental to an express authority, is to be regarded, but the degree of its importance also; since on this will depend the probability of its being left to the construction.

Reviewing the Constitution with an eye to these positions, it was not possible to discover in it the power to incorporate a bank. The only clauses under which such a power could be pretended, are either—

1. The power to lay and collect taxes, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defence and general welfare; or,
2. The power to borrow money on the credit of the United States; or,
3. The power to pass all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution those powers.

The bill did not come within the first power. It laid no tax to pay the debts, or provide for the general welfare. It laid no tax whatever. It was altogether foreign to the subject.

No argument could be drawn from the terms, "common defence, and general welfare." The power, as to these general purposes, was limited to acts laying taxes for them; and the general purposes themselves were limited and explained by the particular enumeration subjoined. To understand these terms in any sense that would justify the power in question, would give to Congress an unlimited power; would render nugatory the enumeration of particular powers; would supersede all the powers reserved to the State governments. These terms are copied from the articles of confederation. Had it ever been pretended, that they were to be understood otherwise than as here explained?

It had been said, that "general welfare" meant cases in which a general power might be exercised by Congress, without interfering with the powers of the States; and that the establishment of a National Bank was of this sort. There were, he said, several answers to this novel doctrine.

1. The proposed bank would interfere so as indirectly to defeat a State bank at the same place.

2. It would directly interfere with the rights of the States to prohibit as well as to establish banks, and the circulation of bank notes. He mentioned a law of Virginia, actually prohibiting the circulation of notes payable to bearer.

3. Interference with the power of the States was no constitutional criterion of the power of Congress. If the power was not given, Congress could not exercise it; if given, they might exercise it, although it should interfere with the laws, or even the Constitution of the States.

4. If Congress could incorporate a bank, merely because the act would leave the States free to establish banks also, any other incorporations might be made by Congress. They could incorporate companies of manufactures, or companies for cutting canals, or even religious societies, leaving similar incorporations by the State, like State banks, to themselves. Congress might even establish religious teachers in every parish, and pay them out of the treasury of the United States, leaving other teachers unmolested in their functions. These inadmissible consequences condemned the controverted principle.

The case of the bank established by the former Congress had been cited as a precedent. This was known, he said, to have been the child of necessity. It never could be justified by the regular powers of the articles of confederation. Congress betrayed a consciousness of this in recommending to the States to incorporate the bank also. They did not attempt to protect the bank notes by penalties against the counterfeitors. These were reserved wholly to the authority of the States.

The second clause to be examined, is, that which empowers Congress to borrow money.

Is this a bill to borrow money? Is there any fair construction by which the bill can be deemed an exercise of the power to borrow money? The obvious meaning of the power to borrow money, is that of accepting it from, and stipulating payment to, those who are *able* and *willing* to lend.

To say that the power to borrow involves a power of creating the ability, where there may be the will to lend, is not only establishing a dangerous principle, as will be immediately shown, but is as forced a construction as to say that it involves the power of compelling the will, where there may be the ability to lend.

The third clause is that which gives the power to pass all laws necessary and proper to execute the specified powers.

The clause is in fact merely declaratory of what would have resulted by unavoidable implication, as the appropriate, and as it were, technical means of executing those powers. In this sense it has been explained by the friends of the Constitution, and ratified by the State Conventions.

The essential characteristic of the government, as composed of limited and enumerable powers, would be destroyed, if, instead of direct and incidental means, any means could be used, which, in the language of the preamble to the bill, "might be conceived to be conducive to the successful conducting of the finances; or might be *conceived* to tend to give *facility* to the obtaining of loans." He urged an attention to the diffuse and ductile terms which had been found requisite to cover the stretch of power contained in the bill. He compares them with the terms *necessary* and *proper* used in the Constitution, and asked whether it was possible to view the two descriptions as synonymous, or the one as a fair and safe commentary on the other.

If proceeded he, Congress, by virtue of the power to borrow, can create the means of lending, and in pursuance of these means, can incorporate a Bank, they can do any thing whatever creative of like means.

The East India Company has been a lender to the British government, as well as the Bank, and the South Sea Company is a greater creditor than either. Congress then may incorporate similar companies in the United States, and that, too, not under the idea of regulating trade, but under that of borrowing money.

Private capitals are the chief resources for loans to the British Government. Whatever then may be conceived to favor the accumulation of capitals may be done by Congress. They may incorporate manufactures. They may give monopolies in every branch of domestic industry.

If, again, Congress, by virtue of the power to borrow money, can create the ability to lend, they may by virtue of the power to levy money, create the ability to pay it. The ability to pay taxes depends on the general wealth of the society, and this, on the general prosperity of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. Congress then may give bounties and make regulations on all these subjects.

The States have, it is allowed on all hands, concurrent right to lay and collect taxes. This power is secured to them, not by its being expressly reserved, but by its not being ceded by the Constitution. The reasons for the bills cannot be admitted, because they would invalidate that right. Why may it not be conceived by Congress that a uniform and exclusive imposition of banks, "be conducive to the successful conducting of the national finances, and *tend* or *give facility* to the obtaining of revenue for the use of the government?"

The doctrine of implication is always a tender one. The danger of it has been felt in other governments. The delicacy was felt in the adoption of our own; the danger may also be felt, if we do not keep close to our chartered authorities.

Mark the reasoning on which the validity of the bill depends. To borrow money is made the *end*, and the accumulation of capitals implied as the *means*. The accumulation of capitals is then the *end*, and a bank implied as the *means*. The bank is then the *end*, and the charter of incorporation, a monopoly, capital punishment, &c. implied as the *means*.

If implications thus remote and thus multiplied, can be linked together, a chain may be formed that will reach every object of legislation, every object within the whole compass of political economy.

The latitude of interpretation required by the bill is condemned by the rule furnished by the Constitution itself.

Congress have power "to regulate the value of money;" yet it is expressly added, not left to be implied, that counterfeiters may be punished.

They have the power "to declare war;" to which armies are more incident, than incorporated banks to borrowing; yet it is expressly added, the power "to raise and support armies;" and to this again, the express power "to make rules and regulations for the government of armies;" a like remark is applicable to the powers as to a navy.

The regulation and calling out of the militia, are more appertaining to war, than the proposed bank to borrowing, yet the former is not left to construction.

It is not pretended that every insertion or omission in the Constitution is the effect of systematic attention. This is not the character of any human work, particularly the work of a body of men. The examples cited, with others that might be added, sufficiently inculcate nevertheless a rule of interpretation, very different from that on which the bill rests. They condemn the exercise of any power, particularly a great and important power, which is not evidently and necessarily involved in an express power.

It cannot be denied that the power proposed to be exercised is an important power.

As a charter or incorporation the bill creates an artificial person previously not existing in law. It confers important civil rights and attributes, which could not otherwise be claimed. It is, though, not precisely similar, at least equivalent, to the naturalization of an alien; by which certain new civil characters are required by him. Would Congress have had the power to naturalize, if it had not been expressly given?

In the power to make by-laws, the bill delegated a sort of legislative power, which is unquestionably an act of a high and important nature. He took notice of the only restraint on the by-laws, that they were not to be contrary to the law and the constitution of the Bank; and asked what law was intended; if the law of the United States, the scantiness of their code would have given a power never before given to a corporation—and obnoxious to the States, whose laws would then be superseded not only by the laws of Congress, but by the by-laws of a corporation within their own jurisdiction. If the law intended, was the law of the State, then the States might make laws that would destroy an institution of the United States.

The bill gives a power to purchase and hold lands. Congress themselves could not purchase lands within a State, "without the consent of its Legislature." How could they delegate a power to others, which they did not possess themselves?

It takes from our successors, who have equal rights with ourselves, and with the aid of experience will be more capable of deciding on the subject, an opportunity of exercising that right, for an immediate term.

It takes from our constituents the opportunity of deliberating on the untried measure, although their hands are also to be tied by it for the same term.

It involves a monopoly, which affects the equal rights of every citizen.

It leads to a penal regulation, perhaps capital punishments, one of the most solemn acts of sovereign authority.

From this view of the power of incorporation, exercised in the bill, it could never be deemed an accessory or a subaltern power, to be deduced by implication, as a means of executing another power; it was in its nature a distinct, an independent, and substantive prerogative, which not being enumerated in the Constitution, could never have been meant to be included in it, and not being included, could never be rightfully exercised.

He here adverted to a distinction which he said had not been sufficiently kept in view between a power necessary and proper for the Government or Union, and a power necessary and proper for executing the enumerated powers. In the latter case, the powers included in each of the enumerated powers, were not expressed, but to be drawn from the nature of each. In the former, the powers composing the government were expressly enumerated. This constituted the peculiar nature of the government: no power, therefore, not enumerated, could be inferred from the general nature of government. Had the power of making treaties, for example, been omitted, however necessary it might have been, the defect could only have been lamented, or supplied by an amendment to the Constitution.

But the proposed bank could not even be called necessary to the government; at most it could be but convenient. Its uses to the government could be supplied by keeping the taxes a little in advance—by loans from individuals—by the other banks, over which the government would have equal command; nay, greater, as it may grant or refuse to these the privilege, make a free and irrevocable gift to the proposed bank, of using their notes in the federal revenue.

He proceeded next to the cotemporary expositions given to the Constitution.

The defence against the charge founded on the want of a bill of rights, pre-supposed, he said, that the powers not given were retained; and that these given were not to be extended by remote implications. On any other supposition, the power of Congress to abridge the freedom of the press, or the rights of conscience, &c. could not have been disproved.

The explanations in the State conventions all turned on the same fundamental principles, and on the principles that the terms necessary and proper gave no additional powers to those enum-

rated. [Here he read sundry passages from the debates of the Pennsylvania, Virginia, and North Carolina conventions, showing the grounds on which the Constitution had been vindicated by its principal advocates, against a dangerous latitude of its powers, charged on it by its opponents.] He did not undertake to vouch for the accuracy or authenticity of the publications which he quoted—he thought it probable that the sentiments delivered might in many instances, have been mistaken, or imperfectly noted; but the complexion of the whole, with what he himself and many others must recollect, fully justified the use he had made of them.

The explanatory declarations and amendments accompanying the ratifications of the several States, formed a striking evidence, wearing the same complexion. He referred those who might doubt on the subject, to the several acts of ratification.

The explanatory amendments proposed by Congress themselves, at least, would be good authority with them: all these renunciations of power proceeded on a rule of construction, excluding the latitude now contended for. These explanations were the more to be respected, as they had not only been proposed by Congress, but ratified by nearly three-fourths of the States. He read several of the articles proposed, remarking particularly on the 11th and 12th; the former, as guarding against a latitude of interpretation; the latter, as excluding every source of power not within the Constitution itself.

With all this evidence of the sense in which the constitution was understood and adopted, will it not be said, if the bill should pass, that its adoption was brought about by one set of arguments, and that it is now administered under the influence of another set; and this reproach will have the keener sting, because it is applicable to so many individuals, concerned in both the adoption and the administration.

In fine, if the power were in the constitution, the immediate exercise of it cannot be essential—if not there, the exercise of it involves the guilt of usurpation, and establishes a precedent of interpretation levelling all the barriers which limit the powers of the General Government, and protect those of the State Governments. If the point be doubtful only, respect for ourselves, who ought to shun the appearance of precipitancy and ambition; respect for our successors, who ought not lightly to be deprived of the opportunity of exercising the rights of legislation; respect for our constituents, who have had no opportunity of making known their sentiments, and who are themselves to be bound down to the measure for so long a period; all these considerations require that the irrevocable decision should at least be suspended until another session.

It appeared, on the whole, he concluded, that the power exercised by the bill was condemned by the silence of the constitution; was condemned by the rule of interpretation arising out of the constitution; was condemned by its tendency to destroy the main character of the constitution; was condemned by the expositions of the friends of the constitution, while depending before the public; was condemned by the apparent intention of the parties which ratified the constitution; was condemned by the explanatory amendments proposed by Congress themselves to the constitution; and he hoped it would receive its final condemnation by the vote of this house.

SPEECH OF THE HON. ISAAC HILL, AT A PUBLIC DINNER GIVEN IN HONOR OF HIM, At Haverhill, New Hampshire, Oct. 22, 1834.

"Our Guest, the Hon. Isaac Hill.—If there be any merit in contending fearlessly, ably, zealously, uniformly and successfully in the cause of Democracy and for the rights of the People, he has that merit and the People will reward him for it."

Mr. HILL acknowledged his obligations to the company for the high honor they had done him; and said if there had been any merit in his political life and exertions, he had already been amply rewarded: the People of his State had bestowed on him honors he had never deserved, and a station which filled the whole measure of his political ambition.

Mr. Hill continued:—There is in a neighboring State a broken down politician whose aspirations for public favor have recently been met by repeated and sore disappointment—the ruby hue of whose face has not been more prominent than the staleness of his worn-out wit. This man was sent for at a late public dinner in this State to play the Harlequin—to act as the buffoon of the farce; and he is said to have elicited more applause than any other actor on the occasion by repeating such miserable vulgarities as he had on the floor of Congress delivered for the hundredth time. His most forcible flash of wit at the dinner, and which received thunders of applause, was the ejaculation, while taking from his pocket a written paper—"Don't be alarmed, gentlemen—I am not going to *read* a speech!"

As it was frequently by slants like these that the aforesaid po-

litician attempted often to ridicule such arguments as he did not find it convenient to answer in the Senate chamber of the United States, there were but few present at the exhibition who did not understand the intended allusion: Yet the person who now addresses you, represented as he has been as unable to open his mouth in an extemporaneous address and claiming no pretensions as a public speaker, presumes to place himself before those who have long known him without any *written* preparation.

It gives me peculiar pleasure at this time, (said Mr. Hill,) to meet so many honest Democratic faces from the county of Grafton. I see around me several of the steady republicans from 1809 to the present time—the men who were friends, as well when our party was a minority as while it is a majority. Of the men who are gone and who yet live, memory will to the latest hour of my life present the names of Tarleton, (persecuted to the death for his inflexible Democracy,) Dow, Robbins, Bedel, White, Durkee, Huntington, Miller, Rix, Woods, Crawford, Boardman, Burns, Weeks, Page, Carleton, Obed, Hall, and others living and who have lived within the ancient limits (now Grafton and Coos) of old Grafton. These men, who have been Democrats through good report and through evil report, originally but a little band, persecuted and proscribed for their Democracy, from a small minority have increased to a decided ascendancy in the county. The growth of Democratic principles here has been commensurate with the prosperity and growth of the towns: as the fertile vallies have been cleared, and as the settlements have extended upon the hills and the mountain sides,—as information and knowledge have been diffused and spread among the people—so have extended liberal principles, so have republican principles found ready access to honest hearts.

I have observed (said Mr. Hill) that our young men, the sons of honest farmers and mechanics, whose fathers for some cause have acted and voted with the aristocracy, are generally Democratic. To this circumstance in part may be attributed the present strength of the Democratic Party in Grafton and Coos. So strong is the force of habit, that I have seen honest men, acting with their party, countenance political dishonesty and knavery—I have seen such men starting as Federalists under some aristocratic leader, pursuing political absurdities at the call of their leader through life; and I have seen the sons of such men, arrived at years when they may act for themselves, throw off and cast behind them the sinister influence that has long misdirected their parents.

Speaking of this County, Mr. Hill said he might be permitted to allude to the persecution of the only Democratic press in the county. It had been a settled plan of the Federal leaders in this State in the year 1830 to break down the Republican press by prosecutions for libel.

Simultaneous prosecutions against a principal Democratic paper at Concord and another Democratic paper in this town were at that time commenced. One of these prosecutions had resulted three years ago in the deep disgrace of its authors, and an everlasting stigma had fixed itself on the principal prosecutor who had aspired to the first honors of the State, but who was now beneath even the contempt of its most humble citizen.

The other prosecution against a printer in this county had been kept in court ten terms embracing half as many years—had been several times tried, and at one trial a verdict had been rendered for the defendant—at other times a verdict had been denied in consequence of vindictive partisans opposed to the printer being on the jury, and urging a verdict for the plaintiff with nominal damages.

I have good reason to believe that the nominal plaintiff in this suit is not the real prosecutor—that the man who is at the bottom of the matter is a Bank aristocrat, whose object is to ruin its owner and drive your Democratic press from the county—that the plan is part and parcel of a more extensive project formed in the early part of General Jackson's administration to silence the Democratic presses of this State.

Now this persecution of Democratic presses is but a species of the tory spirit of 1798—it smells of the old sedition law. If any newspaper press in the country outrages the truth, there is a remedy much more salutary than prosecution and fine: the indignation, the withdrawal of the patronage of the public, presents the most effectual punishment. The doctrine that the truth is a libel cannot obtain in this free country; and the prosecution of printers on every frivolous pretence—the keeping up suits against a printer by an unprincipled Federal lawyer who can carry on his suit with little expense, that whether successful or not he may worry out and ruin his victim—should be put down by the strong voice of the popular indignation.

Besides citizens of this State and County, I perceive gentlemen present from the adjacent State of Vermont. That State is quite as Democratic in principle, if not in present practice as any of her sisters: during the last war, and in the great Presidential contest of 1812, Vermont was the last of the States of New England to desert the Democratic Standard. And she would now

have been among the foremost to support the general administration, had not an honest and unaccountable delusion been practised upon her by the adversary. That very delusion under the circumstances does credit to the character of her citizens. Many honest men have been honestly drawn into Anti-masonry. It is not surprising that jealous republicans, after the abduction and cold-blooded murder of a fellow-mortals, after the pains that had been taken to identify that murder with the whole Masonic fraternity, should have looked on Free-masonry as dangerous to the liberties of the country.

I have good reason to believe that the propagation of Anti-masonry was one of those plots many of which have been invented by the party who have attempted in various shapes to delude and mislead the People, believing they might be misled with impunity. Certain leading politicians opposed to the Democracy, some of whom were themselves Free-masons, were deeply concerned in propagating this delusion, that the public attention might be diverted from the true question in issue. A large sum of money was raised among the office holders in Washington in 1827 to establish anti-masonic presses in the Westerly part of the State of New York.

Succeeding well there, another agent in the confidence of Henry Clay (a high mason) came to Vermont in 1829, and travelled through the State lecturing and preaching on the subject of anti-masonry, and so well succeeded as to procure for himself an election to Congress. This agent since the commencement of the present session of the Vermont legislature has been at the seat of Government and earnestly contended for the proposition that the anti-masonic party, which is the most numerous party in that State, should be dissolved and join en masse the self-styled whig party!

There is evidently a serious schism in the anti-masonic party of Vermont.

A portion of that party are honest Democrats opposed to the United States Bank.

They already see that the intention of the political anti-masons who unite themselves to the aristocracy is to make them the mere instruments; that those political anti-masons are at heart Tory Federalists, determined that no honest Republican shall hold any office.

These are ready and anxious to unite with their brother Democrats with whom they were wont to act in other times.

Within a few days the anti-masons of Vermont have separated into two divisions, and there is little probability that they will ever again come together. The charm is broken in that State—the whole Democracy of the State will unite; and we need not be surprised before the next great contest for the Presidency, to see the Green-Mountain Boys acting in full communion with the great Democratic phalanx of the Union.

I have alluded to a dinner or entertainment which was given at the Capital of this State by the party claiming “*all the talents*,” where it was found necessary to send out of the State for speakers to address the assembled body. That dinner was given professedly in approbation of the course of the only gentleman in the Congress of the United States acting in opposition to the State and National administrations, and who has been superseded in office by one of different politics elected by the chosen representatives of the People the present year.

That gentleman made statements which, as one of the persons impugned by party who support the present National Executive the “vilest corruption”—that they have “sought power in the garb of reformers, and obtained it by fraud and misrepresentation”—that “integrity and ability are now no longer the passports to Executive favor”—that “mail contracts and other agencies have been made the engines of corruption”—that “many of the ablest editors have been bought up”—that the expenditures of the Government have been unnecessarily increased, and that three unnecessary departments have been added to the administration at Washington. He says the People are “honest” but that they have been “greatly deluded,” and that now the odds and ends and fragments of parties,—the nationals and nullifiers—have united under the name of Whigs, “we have great encouragement to exert ourselves!”

Every Democrat who has pursued the steady course of principle for the last five years, turning neither to the right hand or the left for preachers who have successively attempted to create excitements by appealing to the fears of the People; every Democrat who has not seen fit to follow the leaders of the American System when they called for higher duties to exasperate the People of the South as well as when they proposed to reduce the duties to conciliate the nullification party—who has not attempted to rally to a civil war on account of the imprisoned missionaries and the “poor Indians”—who has refused to unite in the hue and cry on account of the Bank of the United States and the withdrawal of the deposits;—must consider the charges and accusations of the Senator as a marked personal insult.

Is it not sufficient, in violation of the promise which he solemnly made, that he has year after year, for more than five years, misrepresented a decided majority of the people of New Hampshire! Must he add a new reproach by telling them that they have been “deluded!” His charge of “vilest corruption” shall be indignantly hurled back into his own teeth. What party is more corrupt than that with which he has acted and now acts? None have been more anxious than this gentleman and the Senators who appear as witnesses in his behalf to increase the public expenditures—none have been more zealous to vote the highest sums called for from the treasury.

Look at the enormous expenditure of the Senate for the public printing during the last session.

The printer of the Senate is a Nullifier, elected to office by a combination of the Nationals and Nullifiers.

The printing ordered at the last session, throwing so much money into the printer's hands, will amount to from sixty to an hundred thousand dollars!

Formerly the printing of the Senate did not exceed seven thousand dollars a session and was frequently even less; and it was thought to be enormous in the first year of Duff Green that the printing of the Senate was raised to \$15,000 for the session.

But as if there were no bounds to the extravagance of that Senate which for six months of its last session did scarcely nothing else than attempt to create panic and distress by *preaching* panic and distress, the same Senate orders printing during a single session which will cost not less than fifteen hundred dollars for each individual Senator, to be paid as a reward for the partisan services of a printer claiming no other merit than that of unrelenting hatred to the administration and to the man whom the People have twice placed at the head of the Government, by majorities unprecedented in any former contested election.

Nor is this “corruption,” this “buying up” of one of the “ablest editors” all that the disobeying Senator may take to himself. Hundreds of thousands of dollars expenditure have been repeatedly voted by the same majority of the Senate which oppose the present administration to reward, not Duff Green alone, but the partisan editors of the National Intelligencer and National Journal—a half a million of dollars to the first for reprinting the old documents and Journals, and not less than four hundred thousand dollars to the second for the publication of what is called “a documentary history of the American Revolution” being just such a collection as a partisan writer of the opposition chooses to make at the expense of the nation!

Talk of “vilest corruption” on the part of the friends of the administration! Why, Mr. President, it is a fact that three out of four of the applicants for office at Washington—the real hangars-on, who will take no denial, but persist in their entreaties till they succeed—are men of the opposition; and many of them succeed—for these gentlemen the very moment they arrive and lay in their claims are no longer party men! Robert Temple of Vermont, who when away from Washington scarcely drew a breath when he did not vociferate some abuse of General Jackson and his friends—Robert Temple, supposed to be one of the most wealthy men of his State, was an applicant for a Clerk's office in the War Department at Washington. Think you, Sir, that he had any corrupt design? It is not evident that his design in attempting to get that place was to conceal the “vilest corruption?” Robert Temple has gone to his account with a load of enormity unaccounted for of which few men have been guilty. Shall we make his party accountable for his acts—a systematic and successful plan of defrauding the public treasury for a succession of years by forgery and simulation to the amount probably of fifty or an hundred thousand dollars? While the real pensioner of the revolution has been receiving the pay of one, Robert Temple has been receiving the pay of perhaps a hundred soldiers of the revolution—some of them cases of fiction, and others under names of persons who had been dead for years before the pension laws had passed. I have seen some of the papers in virtue of which this man drew money from the treasury. They had genuine certificates and signatures of officers and magistrates—Mr. Temple's political associates and friends—living in his immediate neighborhood. They were all of his party; and had the men who certify that on such a day a man purporting to be a revolutionary pensioner who never existed made oath to an entire fictitious statement only finished their attestation by the last act of Robert Temple, they too might be considered as no less “corrupt” than he.

Mr. President, there has been scarcely any proposition for extraordinary expenditure brought into Congress that has not been sanctioned and advocated by the party acting with my colleague, and virtually sanctioned by that gentleman himself. Look at the enormous expenditures that have been prevented by President Jackson's veto on the Maysville road bill—projects were agitated which in the first instance would have saddled the public with an expenditure of a hundred millions of dollars. As a substitute

for these expenditures, the American System party have presented others,—they have voted to lavish money on almost every possible measure that could be devised; and after assisting to carry through every new expenditure—Mr. Webster and others have openly exulted in the prospect that before the close of the year the public treasury would become bankrupt!

The "three departments" complained of by the disobeying Senator were all supported by the Senator's party. It is well known that the office and bureau of the Solicitor of the Treasury was a favorite measure introduced into Congress by Mr. Webster, and understood to be introduced for the sole purpose of creating a snug office for a particular friend of Mr. Calhoun, and the Indian bureau and Pension bureau were likewise created at the instance and had the strong support of the party in opposition.

The sober truth is, that what with the Tariff and American System—what with the aid given to the opposition by Mr. Calhoun and his corps of Nullifiers—and with what log-rolling in local appropriations—General Jackson has been in a minority in both Houses of Congress the greater part of the time since 1829. Enormous appropriations which were never recommended by the President, has been forced upon him: these appropriations, if they were of an extraordinary character, were generally for the benefit and introduced into Congress at the instance of the enemies of the administration. The last session discovered an intense anxiety to rid the People of the money, that the Government might be obliged to resort to the Bank for aid. Indeed contending as was the veteran Patriot almost single-handed with the Bank, it was scarcely possible he should by the exertion of his personal influence alone accomplish those salutary reforms which all republicans much desire. I myself can bear witness to the great anxiety of the President to prevent unnecessary expenditures, and to punish and dismiss all those unfaithful officers and agents who abuse the confidence reposed in them. If corruption exists, it is most manifest that a large share of it belongs to the opposition party, because it is most true that of the large amount annually appropriated from the treasury, much the largest portion passes through the hands of, and is expended by men who are hostile to Andrew Jackson and his administration.

An honorable Senator from Massachusetts also made his appearance at the Concord dinner "gladly in the character of a witness to bear conscientious and ready testimony to the able manner in which he (Mr. Bell.) has supported the interest and credit of the State." If to disobey the voice of his constituents—if to treat the People of his State with marked scorn and contumely—if to reproach those who have been repeatedly elected to important offices as being "the scum of the political pot"—if violation of his own plighted faith to resign when he should no longer represent the will of his constituents—if charging those who disagree with him in opinion with the "vilest corruption"—be supporting "the interest and credit of the State," then has the voluntary "witness" spoken the truth in this case. It surely needed some witness, not from another world, but at least from another State—from the Federal "Bay State"—to convince any respectable number of citizens that the gentleman who had misrepresented the People of his State for nearly six years, had ably supported the interest and credit of his State." The two gentlemen together would subserve the "interest and the credit" of the People of New Hampshire by saving them from their worst enemies themselves! This is truly in character for the aristocrat and contemner of the People's rights!

But the "witness" from Massachusetts has discovered "if the ancient revolutionary heroes of New Hampshire—Langdon, Whipple, Bartlett, Gilman, Sullivan, Poor, Stark, &c. &c. were now in the land of the living, every man of them would be on our side!" Does any man believe that these Patriots, if now living, would have espoused the cause of the self-styled Whigs of the present day? (Yes, exclaimed a revolutionary man—Gilman probably might, but not one of the rest.) Gilman was not, as I have understood, a revolutionary hero—I never heard that he either took up arms, or warmly espoused the American cause.

But John Langdon and John Stark were living (said Mr. Hill,) since I arrived at the age of manhood—I knew them both—I knew the former personally to oppose Daniel Webster at the polls in Portsmouth, and I knew both Langdon and Stark, while living, to be objects of the inveterate political hatred of the witness from Massachusetts. If either of them had been in active life during the late war—as both of them, advanced to great age took a strong interest in that contest—he would have done what the Massachusetts Senator never did—he would have marched to meet the enemy. If either of them had been in Congress, he would have voted, not as the Massachusetts Senator voted, against supplies for the army and navy, against raising men and money, but to furnish and sustain both. The gentleman would have found much to his chagrin that neither Langdon or Stark would have been on his side in that memorable contest, nor in any other political contest in which he ever was engaged. The ears of the

wolf are too palpable to cover such detestable hypocrisy from such a source in appeals to the men of the revolution.

I should trespass on the time of the company to notice at length the extraordinary testimony of the Massachusetts witness. His gratuitous assumption that it was "admitted" and "had not been denied" that an attempt was made in this State in 1829 by the Jackson party to convert the Branch Bank of New Hampshire into a party engine, is conclusively proved to be untrue by the acknowledged signatures of many most respectable men of his own party then petitioning the Board of Directors of the mother Bank at Philadelphia for a change in the management of the Branch in this State. This gross assumption must go with the declaration of the Senator in which he denied that he voted against the charter of the Bank in 1816—with that in which he falsely charges Secretary Taney with a breach of the laws and constitution in appointing an agent for the Banks, when no such agent had been appointed—and with other reckless untruths told by the witness as well in his Concord speech as in other productions of the same character during the last twenty years. The gentleman has assumed to himself so much the character of Sir Oracle, that he seems to take it for granted that those at least who are on "our side" will dispute no position he assumes whether founded in truth or otherwise.

I will confess to you, sir, that it was not without indignation that I read the following threat in the Massachusetts Senator's speech.

"It would be easy however, to show that the act of the Executive had produced great distress and pressure—the pressure would be renewed and repeated until the cause was removed!"

The same Senator in May last, in one of his speeches during the late session of Congress, as reported by himself, said—

"What has the Bank done? It stood still; said little; and did nothing! Its charter was about to expire, and it consequently called in its debts slowly, much too slowly, *in his opinion, for its own good, and the ultimate interests of the people.*"

It appears that the curtailment of the Bank since the deposits were withdrawn, up to the 1st October including the additional specie (more than ten millions) which it has hoarded up, now amounts to at least twenty-six millions of dollars. In the opinion of the Massachusetts Senator is this not enough for the "good" of the Bank and the "ultimate interests of the People?" If it had been more—if the Bank, depriving the State Banks of the benefit of the public deposits, could have compelled them to curtail much more than they did curtail, the "ultimate interests" of the People, and the "good" of the Bank would have been promoted by forcing a re-charter!

If the Massachusetts Senator will look back on his attempts to create panic and distress during the late memorable session of Congress—if he will recur to his predictions of ruin and universal prostration of business which have *not* (thank God!) been verified—he will find that the People have cause forever to discard him and those with whom he has acted. Does he flatter himself that the threat he makes at this hour that the "pressure will be renewed and repeated until the cause is removed"—until the deposits shall be restored—will now be heeded by the People? Alas for him—it is not now in his power—it is not in the power of the Bank to "renew" and "repeat" the distress. The Bank may now affect seriously its own friends who have had its accommodations—it may "distress" Mr. Webster himself, who is said to have been under obligations to it to an amount that might startle the men of modest pecuniary expectations in the Granite State; but it cannot oppress or distress to any considerable extent the whole community. Doubtless Mr. Webster may consider that it would be for the "ultimate interest" of the People if the Bank had this power, and would exercise it to their chastening until they should grant what his interest so much requires!

A committee of the New York merchants; friends of Mr. Webster and the Bank, in a letter to the President of the Bank, some months ago, said—

"A large portion of the difficulties under which the commercial community have labored for some months past has arisen from the restrictions deemed necessary on the part of the Bank."

The President of the Bank himself admits in answer to this letter of the merchants that the Bank may extend accommodations to the merchants to the amount of ten millions! yet, instead of making that extension the Bank has actually curtailed from the 1st of July to the 1st of October 1834, more than five millions of dollars!

The whole curtailment is now eighteen millions in round numbers, and the increased amount of specie hoarded up by the Bank, eight millions more, and of course withdrawn from circulation makes the amount withdrawn from public use by the Bank to be TWENTY-SIX MILLIONS OF DOLLARS!

Is not this enough for the Senator from Massachusetts? The Bank has indeed acted well its part to verify his prophecies, and his panic speeches. Can it be denied that the panic makers of the Se-

nate have waged a most reckless and relentless warfare against the pecuniary interests and the prosperity of the country? What better is he who attempts the ruin of masses of his fellow citizens, than the midnight incendiary who fires your dwelling? It is now evident that the panic attacks made in the Senate of the United States by the Massachusetts witness and his co-peers upon the commercial credit of the country, and upon the confidence of the public in their monied institutions, were intended to have effect; that the speeches in Congress increased the pressure very sensibly; that they cost the nation millions of dollars. "While the leaders at Washington sounded the trumpet to cheer them on, organized bands of incendiaries in every part of the country carried on their systematic efforts to destroy that confidence which is the life of credit. They reported failures which never happened—they exaggerated all that did happen—they pretended to doubt the credit of the Deposit Banks—they concerted ruin upon the Safety Fund Banks of New York, and agitated fabricated accounts of numerous failures of Banks in the South and West. Nor did they confine themselves to the invention of imaginary distress, and the exaggeration of what really existed. They assured their dupes that all the misery, horrible as it was in their description, was light compared with what was soon to follow."

And now the Massachusetts witness, in the character of both witness and prophet, declares that "the pressure will be renewed and repeated until the cause shall be removed!" Who but him or perhaps the Senator from Kentucky can thus speak with authority? His prediction is good for nothing, for he predicted the universal failure of credit during the past summer, and he predicted the business on the New York canals would be reduced two hundred per cent. that is, one hundred per cent. less than nothing; and both these and others of his predictions failed. But not so his threats, if himself and the Bank united can effect any thing. Both of them, having done their worst, may renew and repeat their efforts: it is believed those efforts will fail, and that those who make them will retire from the field with no less disgrace than did the same party from the efforts to bring about a dissolution of the Union during the late war with Great Britain;

I have, in my whole course as a legislator, voted against the chartering of Banks. I have considered the effect of paper credit and paper circulation to be injurious to the great interests of the people. Those who look back twenty-five years well recollect the evils which the people of this State then suffered from the sudden multiplication of Banks. The people of the county of Grafton from that day to the present have felt the effects of a bank monopoly in a few hands: do they want a money accommodation, not one in ten can procure it at the bank—but money can be had of somebody near the bank, may be at twelve, may be at twenty per cent.

Incredible as it may seem, the multiplication of banks and of fictitious paper credit makes money more scarce in a time of scarcity in the precise ratio that it makes money too plenty when it cannot be used to the advantage of the holder. It is the paper system which produces sudden fluctuations and revulsions in trade.

The introduction of a specie currency is the best remedy against sudden revulsions in trade and credit. Late events have aroused the public attention; and I trust that soon the Legislatures of the several States will put an end to the circulation of small bank notes, beginning with those under five dollars, and gradually excluding them under ten and even under twenty dollars, if it shall be found useful. Already has the gold bill of the last session of Congress had its beneficial effect, especially in the state of Pennsylvania, where bank notes of less than five dollars had been excluded. That bill aided by state regulation will make gold a substitute for rag currency—it will be the means of placing the currency of the country on a foundation that cannot be shaken by all the panic makers that self-styled whigs can send into Congress—it will place it beyond the power of banks or a combination of banks to shake the public credit.

I have said I am opposed to state banks. When a member of the House of Representatives of this state in 1823, I take to myself some credit for having aided by my efforts in defeating the charter of a batch of fourteen banks which were then applied for in this state, and to procure which there had been a combination of local interests from several considerable towns of the state. Since that time a few banks have been granted by way of defense against the inroads made by the numerous grants of other states. These state banks are all subject to state taxation, and contribute to the support of the public treasury: being under the control of our legislatures, they are not as dangerous as they might otherwise be. But restricted and guarded even as they are, they are still attended with evils of which, in the interior country, it may be a question whether these are not greater than the corresponding benefits.

If state banks, regulated and restricted by state laws—confined within due limits by salutary competition with each other;—if

state banks are an evil—what shall we say of the United States Bank; a corporation acknowledging the right of no state government in any manner to interfere with it—and now not even acknowledging the right of Congress, to examine into its affairs: a corporation which claims the whole money funds of the government as for its own use in addition to its immense capital: a corporation which has no competitor, and which, from its connexion with the government and the right which it claims to make its own paper promises and even its own paper orders a substitute for specie in all government payments, can control the entire currency of the nation; a corporation which can raise or depress prices at its pleasure, having in its power to ruin every business man who trades in any considerable degree on credit: a corporation which may be entirely owned and controlled, and in part now is owned and controlled by wealthy foreigners, and which, while foreigners not naturalized are excluded from holding and owning real estate, may buy up and own half of the real estate of the country?

This Monopoly, although it has existed since the adoption of the Constitution nearly forty years, is without warrant in that Constitution.

Before the first charter which extended twenty years ending in 1811 was granted, the illustrious Jefferson protested against it as an institution in "direct violation of, and dangerous to the spirit of the Federal Constitution;" and subsequently he declared the institution to be "one of the most deadly hostility existing against the principles and form of our Constitution."

George Clinton in 1811, as President of the Senate, immortalized his name by giving the casting vote against the re-charter of the old Bank.

Had this institution existed during the late war with Great Britain owned and controlled by the same party which now owns and controls it, there is not a doubt in my mind that the Bank would have forced an ignominious peace with Great Britain which would have restored us to the vassalage that many men in this country since the revolution have much desired.

If Clinton, revolutionary veteran as he was, had performed no other service than vote against the Bank, his name would be remembered with gratitude until the history of passing events should be obliterated.

But, at the close of the late war with Great Britain an unaccountable delusion seems to have seized on the public mind, that the failure of public credit during that memorable contest was owing to the want of a United States Bank!

It is well known that the Senator from Massachusetts and other violent "Peace party men in war" were then opposed to the Bank, because they believed that the Bank might be instrumental in restoring the public credit and thus benefit the administration to which they were opposed, Mr. Webster in 1816, made use of the following language.

"The establishment of a National Bank, *not being constitutional*, and not being in his opinion, the *proper remedy* for the then existing evils, he would proceed to examine what it was."

This gentleman then doubtless considered the *proper remedy* to be the turning out of office the men who had successfully conducted the war, and putting in their place himself and the party which had steadily opposed that war; and he then had no idea of bringing a bank to the aid of that administration which he had bitterly opposed. His *patriotism* was about as prominent in opposing the bank in 1816, as it is now in his great exertions to force its re-charter on the people.

Glancing at the history of this Bank since it was re-chartered, we find abundant reasons why the people ought to deny this and all similar grants. Early after the present Bank went into operation, such was the cupidity, of its managers and the imprudence of its management, that it would inevitably have become bankrupt had it not been aided by the funds and credit of the government. Its enormous paper issues, and its more enormous discounts to its own directors, by which they were able to carry their speculations in bank stock to an unwarranted and unprecedented extent, then seriously affected the business of the country. Recovering from the effects of those speculations, and that mismanagement, the Bank for a series of years has labored artfully so to entwine itself into the administration of the government as to make it appear that this or a similar institution was indispensable to the public service. Its friends claimed for it the restoration of public credit, which had been produced not by the bank but by the industry, enterprise and prosperity of our citizens. We had passed through a state of war and privation when there was no bank; and because there was a bank when returning prosperity and business came, it was claimed that the bank had been the cause of accumulated wealth. It was the bank which was indebted to the public industry and enterprise, and not the converse of the proposition.

Approaching the expiration of its charter, President Jackson, early in his administration, signified the sentiment that he was opposed to the re-charter of the Bank. This opinion of the Pre-

sident, thrown out to induce discussion of the merits of the question, was artfully met by the Bank for the purpose of forestalling public opinion. By insidious means, members of Congress and newspaper presses professing friendship to the President, were enlisted and induced to take a stand in favor of the Bank. Successive reports in either branch of Congress were procured from committees; and these reports were extensively circulated, while all discussion in Congress was avoided, and every opportunity to present more than one side of the question was evaded.—Members of Congress were offered accommodations without stint. So strong was the influence of the Bank in the Democratic State of Pennsylvania, that three years ago, resolutions instructing her Senators to vote for a re-charter passed both branches of her Legislature by a unanimous vote.

At this time the Bank professed to have nothing to do with politics—by its jobs and largesses it silenced one printing press after another that opposed it—so that it seemed impossible in some sections of the country, that the people should ever have the means of understanding more than one side of the question.

The Bank was induced openly to enter the field as a political partisan early in the year 1832: its stockholders at its previous annual meeting had instructed its directors to make application to be re-chartered at such time as they might deem expedient. And it is understood, that the party opposed to the administration soon after gave those directors intimation that the Bank must enter the field with its candidate for the Presidency.

The bill for re-chartering the Bank precisely on the terms asked for, was easily carried through both branches of Congress.

The Bank attorneys in either branch did not deign to offer reasons while they could present votes for every thing as the President of the Bank directed. Steadily in the Senate, did every member from New England, with a single exception, (including the "witness" and him in whose behalf the witness bears conscientious testimony)—steadily did these men vote against every proposition not acceded to by Nicholas Biddle himself, which went to give the people of the United States any new advantage or any new power in the management of the great Monopoly. The eleven Senators cared neither of them to answer the irrefutable facts and arguments presented by Mr. Benton and others against the passage of the Bank bill—their only concern seemed to be to hurry the passage of the bill, as though neither reason nor argument was necessary to satisfy the people.

It was but too apparent that a principal object in hurrying the passage of the bank bill in the session of 1832, was not less for the benefit of the Bank's candidate for the Presidency than for the benefit of the Bank itself. The exultation of the opposition members of Congress, that by the passage of the bill Andrew Jackson was placed in a dilemma which would be fatal was felt too strongly not to break forth in vain boasting. The timid friends of the President were alarmed: one of the most conspicuous of these to my knowledge, went to the President and begged of him that he would not veto the bank bill: "Even my popularity (said he) and the large majority in my district, could not stand against such an act." The man first in the affections of the people answered his friend in substance, that his own re-election was a matter of little consequence to him personally; that he should veto the bank bill, be the consequences what they might; and that he should be satisfied to retire to private life, so he discharged what his conscience prompted him to be his duty.

The scene in the Senate on the return of the bill and the veto to that body will ever remain to me in vivid recollection. It was then that the giant intellect of man soared above any thing mortal that I ever before witnessed. It was well known that to prepare for the act of re-charter, the Bank had extended its loans to the western States many millions; and the "witness" from Massachusetts, with malignant joy in his face, exulted over the prospect that the great West must consent either to be ruined, or voluntarily to desert the President of its choice. The gentleman actually made up the issue on this ground, and declared that if Andrew Jackson was elected there would be ruin and no Bank, and if not elected the Bank would be re-chartered, and prosperity would follow in its train. The Senator from Kentucky (himself the candidate of the Bank for President) also brandished the scimitar whetted and prepared to let out the life blood of Andrew Jackson's political existence. The Senator from Missouri answered the Bank attorneys in a style, which convinced all that he had the power to annihilate the Bank Senators on that field in which they then contended.

The issue thus made up was tried before the people: the veto and the President were sustained by an immense majority.

Neither the Bank, nor the Bank Attorneys were satisfied with the trial nor the result. Since that trial and that triumphant result, scenes have occurred which in some regions have appalled the stoutest hearts. The corruptions of a most corrupting institution have been abroad in our land—the Bank has been felt in our elections to the remotest corners of the nation; and the aristocracy of the country, so often defeated in other guises which it

has assumed, now comes forward with the aid of a money Monopoly whose power is felt in every vein and artery of the body politic.

With any other man as President to resist its insidious power than Andrew Jackson, the Bank would probably have been successful. Defeated in the hard struggle of the last Presidency, the Bank had determined to put forth its whole strength in the next election; and for this purpose was husbanding its means to pounce upon the people in 1835-6. The President, foreseeing what would be its enormous power if aided by the whole government funds, prudently resolved to exercise the discretion left to the Executive by the charter, of withdrawing the government deposits from the Bank, and by so much lessening the power of the monopoly to injure the community. For this act of withdrawal, the Bank attorneys and all its minions have not ceased to cry out "Tyrant!" "A violated Constitution!" "Restore the Constitution and the Laws!" when we may fearlessly defy the combined ingenuity of all the Bank partisans in the country to point out in what particular the withdrawal of the deposits has violated either the constitution or the law! The wisdom of the man who alone is entitled to the credit of destroying the Hydra, is manifest in depriving the beast of its means to injure before its fangs were whetted and prepared to strike the fatal blow: the desperation of the Bank and its retainers is increased in proportion to the disappointment they have felt at being compelled to take the field without that ample preparation that the whole means of the government would give them. This desperation is evinced in the recent elections in some of our cities where newspaper editors and men have been "bought like cattle in the market," and where blood has flowed from the stiletto and the fire arms used by Bank assassins. It is likewise evinced in that arrogance which assumed to deny a committee of Congress an investigation as provided by the charter; that its enormities in attempting to bring distress and ruin on the country, and in corrupting the very sources of public liberty, might be concealed. The same desperation is also evinced in the forcible seizure by the bank of \$158,000 of the public money, with no better excuse than I should have to enter on the premises of my neighbor, and, under the plea of claim but without taking any legal steps to establish it, forcibly seize to my own use whatever property came within my reach.

The struggle that is now going on is a struggle of the most momentous character. The Massachusetts Senator, foiled as he has been many times in attempting to resuscitate his party and place power in its hands, calls on the "young men" of New Hampshire to come to the rescue. He tells them that "politics must be made the business of their lives." The young men of the Granite State are prepared for the contest, but they are not yet on what the Senator calls "our side," nor are they likely, from any respect they bear either to his person or his political course, soon to change their ground.

I rejoice, Mr. President, in the prospect which is presented in the result of recent elections in several of the States. It is most remarkable that in those places where the Monopoly has done and can do most injury, there we find the greatest subversiveness. If we were a community of cities, under the influence of mercantile cupidity, well might we despair of the republic. The commercial and trading community in our principal towns during the embargo and war was not on the side of the government in those severe contests. So in the mighty death struggle of the Bank we find one city after another yielding to its power. Look at Cincinnati, owned by the Bank—at Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Richmond, Boston, Providence, Salem, Portland, New Bedford and Bangor—all trammelled by the Bank; look at New York struggling almost in vain in a recent election against the hundreds of thousands expended by the Bank! Cities may and will be corrupted: nearly every considerable town is brought by the Bank to oppose the administration. But thanks to a beneficent Providence who has provided the means of our political salvation in the hardy yeomanry of the interior. If our cities have increased in means and in strength—so have the farmers of the interior kept pace with them in increase of knowledge and all the means of moral and mental independence. Twenty years ago the most of our farmers were in debt and dependent—now a large majority of them are out of debt and independent. The city is more beholden to them than they to the city. Their condition is such that all the money that the Bank can furnish cannot buy them—all the panics that Bank partisans can create cannot terrify them. If a large majority in the cities go *wrong*, a larger majority of men of hard hands and honest hearts, on our hills, mountain sides, plains and vallies, will go *right*.

Mr. President, I will give you as a sentiment—

The Interior and the Cities.—Increasing in numbers and in moral strength, as the physical resources of the country accumulate, the *yeomanry* shall forever present an insurmountable barrier to the corruption of the associated wealth and aristocracy of the larger towns and cities.